

1 Jane Doe  
2 1700 N Point #107  
3 San Francisco, California 94123  
4 Telephone: (415) 875-9571

5 In pro se

FILED  
00 JUN 17 PM 2:56

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
7 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 Jane Doe

11 Plaintiff,

12 vs.

13 CITY OF SAN MATEO, et al.,  
14

15 Defendants.  
16  
17

Case No. C 07-05596 SI

NOTICE OF RELATED CASES

Judge: Hon. Susan Illston

18  
19 TO THE CLERK OF THIS COURT AND TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR  
20 COUNSEL OF RECORD:

21 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that, pursuant to Local Rule 40.1 (e), the above-captioned  
22 case ("*Jane Doe v. City of San Mateo et al*") is related to *Jane Doe v. County of San Mateo et al.*  
23 C.D. Cal Case No. C 08-02541 EMC

24 Local Rule 40.1 (f) defines as related action as multiple proceedings on file in this or any  
25 federal court which:

26 Involve some of the same parties and are based on the same or similar claims, or

27 Involve the same property, transaction, or event, or

28 Involve substantially the same facts and the same question of law.

1 This case is related to C 08-02541 EMC for each of the following reasons:

2 Theses actions involve the "same parties" and are based on similar claims. Specifically, theses  
3 actions involve constitutional violations and denial of equal protection claims based on the same  
4 event by the same and similar parties. For the same reason, theses cases involve the same facts  
5 and the same questions of law.

6 Given that theses cases involve the same defendants, challenge the same or similar  
7 activities, rely on the same or similar evidence, and require analysis under the same statutes and  
8 other legal authorities, there would be a "substantial duplication of labor" if they were heard by  
9 different judges. Simply put, it would be a waste of judicial resources and would likely to unduly  
10 delay and detract from efficient determination of the action to have this case heard by a different  
11 Judge than Judge Illston who is presiding over *Jane Doe v. City of San Mateo et. al.*

12  
13 Dated: June 16, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

14  
15  
16 By: 

17 Jane Doe, plaintiff in pro se  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28